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Annual Report Committee on Inclusiveness in the Profession

The inclusiveness committee undertook the following initiatives for the period July 2016- July 2017

Organized Informal Mini-conference on Diversity and Inclusion.

Together with the University of Washington Department of Philosophy Climate Committee, the APA Committees on the Status of Women in Philosophy, Teaching Philosophy, and Pre-College Instruction in Philosophy, and the Pacific Division of the Society for Women in Philosophy, the Inclusiveness committee contributed to organizing a highly successful and well attended all day mini-conference on Issues of Inclusion and Diversity in Philosophy as part of the 2017 meeting of the Pacific Division of the APA. Using a combination of committee program slots and group meeting time slots, the organizers mounted four back to back sessions. The event was such a success that a similar mini-conferences will be organized for the upcoming meeting of the Pacific Division of the APA.

Sessions included the following:

Institutional and Attitudinal Barriers, Thursday, 9 a.m.–Noon
Speakers: Teresa Blankmeyer Burke, Adam Cureton, Robert Figueroa, Anita Silvers

Inclusiveness in Crisis: How Do We Address Social and Political Flashpoints in Philosophy Courses?, Thursday, 1–4 p.m.
Speakers: Stephen Esquith, Christian Hoeckley, Katie Terezakis, Ruth Groenhout, and Christina Van Dyke

Panel: Outreach and Issues of Recruitment/Retention, Thursday, 4–6 p.m.
Panelists: John Fantuzzo, Adam Blazej, John Torrey, Liam Kofi Bright, and Eva Kittay

Panel: Issues of Inclusion and Diversity in Hiring Practices, Thursday, 6–9 p.m.
Panelists: Linda Martin Alcoff, Carolyn Dicey Jennings, and Naomi Zack

Revised Post Meeting Survey

At the direction of the board, the committee rewrote the post meeting survey, with an eye toward increasing the response rate on the survey. The previous survey sought to measure: (a) perceptions of whether people belonging to 10 marginalized groups were welcomed/included; (b) general perceptions of climate; (c) reactions to 15 specific statements on diversity, sexism, racism, homophobia, and difference. Completing the survey required 39 mouse/keypad clicks. The board believed, and the committee agreed, that the design and length of the survey strongly discouraged completion. The previous survey required 39 clicks to complete. The board directed the committee to redesign the survey to include no more than five questions in
the survey. After considerable deliberation, the committee approved the following five question survey.

1. Was there anything the APA could have done to make you feel more welcomed at the conference. If so, please elaborate.

2. Is there anything that the APA could have done to more the conference more inclusive in your view. Yes/no If yes, please elaborate.

3. Did you personally experience discriminatory behavior or directly encounter barriers to your full participation in the meeting? If so, please elaborate.

4. Did you directly observe discriminatory, dismissive, harassing or otherwise problematic behavior toward others? Please explain.

5. In your assessment, did the conference adequately represent the diversity of philosophical perspectives and approaches. If not, please explain the ways in which the conference fell short in your estimation.

**Formed exploratory committee for possible diversity summits.**

The committee began preliminary discussions on the possibility of holding a series of diversity summits at a series of divisional meetings of the APA. These diversity summits would be organized by a steering committee drawn from the membership of the various diversity committees, participation would be open to all interested members of the APA. The broad aim of the summits would be to foster extended conversations among concerned stakeholders with an eye toward developing concrete action plans, including possibly a series of proposals to the several divisions and the board. We currently envision a series of such summits, held at a series of divisional meetings, spread out over some to be specified time frame. Our first step in this process has been to form an exploratory committee. At the present, there is not much of concrete substance to report from these early stage conversations. It is a priority for the current year to attempt to bring these process into sharper focus.

**Reviewed 19 applications for diversity grants.**

The committee reviewed 19 applications for diversity grants. There was little consensus among the committee on which grants deserved fund, though there were many grants that the committee agreed ought not to be funded. The committee expressed concerned that the lack of consensus may have resulted from different interpretations of stated criteria by different evaluators. The committee would like to see the Board clarify and disambiguate these criteria to the extent practicable.
Screened Diversity Syllabi:

We received 71 submissions -- most were carried over from the previous year. All but four of the submitted syllabi were approved. There is no data on the usage of our diversity syllabus database.
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